

# LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

## PROGRAM:

Legislative Oversight

## PROGRAM ELEMENT:

## PROGRAM MISSION:

To assist the County Council in performing its legislative oversight function by providing accurate information, unbiased analysis, and independent recommendations

## COMMUNITY OUTCOMES SUPPORTED:

- Enhance County Council decisionmaking on budget, legislative, and other policy matters
- Ensure high-value services for tax dollars
- Increase public awareness and confidence in the Council's deliberations and in agency operations

## PROGRAM MEASURES

### Outcomes/Results:

#### Service Quality:

	FY03 ACTUAL	FY04 ACTUAL	FY05 ACTUAL	FY06 BUDGET	FY07 CE REC
Percentage of individuals reporting satisfaction with the quality of Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) reports	89	98	97	95	95
Percentage of individuals reporting satisfaction with their working relationship with OLO staff	100	98	99	95	95
Percentage of new Work Program projects completed within one month of initial target date <sup>a</sup>	75	88	91	90	90

#### Efficiency:

Cost per final report submitted (\$000) <sup>b</sup>	55	61	63	61	70
Percentage of staff time spent on Work Program assignments	86	90	88	90	90

#### Workload/Outputs:

Number of final reports submitted to Council	12	11	11	16	16
Number of Council/Committee worksessions staffed	NA	18	26	32	32

#### Inputs:

Expenditures, excluding independent audit (\$000)	655	673	690	<sup>c</sup> 975.5	1,118
Independent audit contract (\$000)	294	296	296	313	326
Workyears	8.0	8.3	8.0	<sup>c</sup> 9.8	10.0

#### Notes:

<sup>a</sup>OLO identifies target completion dates when the Council adopts the annual OLO Work Program. The target is an estimate based on information available at the beginning of the fiscal year. A number of outside factors affect project completion dates, such as other OLO projects or priorities and cooperation from other agencies and jurisdictions.

<sup>b</sup>These figures include all OLO personnel and operating expenditures, excluding the independent audit contract. The cost per final report submitted varies significantly from year to year, depending on the number and complexity of the projects assigned.

<sup>c</sup>The FY06 increase in expenditures and workyears was due to implementation of the County Council's base budget review initiative.

#### EXPLANATION:

OLO completed 11 projects during FY05. Topics OLO studied during FY05 included tree management practices; Montgomery County Public Schools' spending on special education services; the Executive Branch's non-competitive grants process; an inventory and assessment of planning and coordination for county-funded programs designed to serve seniors; services provided to juvenile victims and witnesses of crime in Montgomery County; gang prevention and intervention programs; the County's rental license and common ownership communities registration fees; language assistance services provided by Montgomery County Public Schools to the school community; and tracking implementation of council actions on two completed OLO reports from FY02. OLO also managed the contracts for the audits of the County Government and the local fire and rescue departments financial statements.

The latest member performance survey from the National Association of Local Government Auditors (NALGA) provides data for comparison with OLO. The NALGA survey\* found that respondents spent 74% of available time on direct audit tasks, completed 74% of engagements or projects by the target completion date, and had a cost per audit hour of \$50 in FY04. For comparison, in FY05 OLO spent 88% of available time on Work Program assignments, completed 91% of assignments within one month of the target completion date, and had a cost per project hour of \$44.

\*National Association of Local Government Auditors, "Report on NALGA's Benchmarking and Best Practices Survey for Fiscal Year 2004," December 2004.

**PROGRAM PARTNERS IN SUPPORT OF OUTCOMES:** County Council and staff, County Government, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Montgomery College, Montgomery County Public Schools, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, other jurisdictions, consultants.

**MAJOR RELATED PLANS AND GUIDELINES:** Chapter 29A Montgomery County Code; Council Resolution 14-965, FY02 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 14-1395, FY03 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 15-281, FY04 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 15-710, FY05 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 15-1092, FY06 Work Program for OLO.